

Algebraic Invariants of Gravity

Hans Detlef Hüttenbach

Abstract. Newton's mechanics is simple. His equivalence principle is simple, as is the inverse square law of gravitational force. A simple theory should have simple solutions to simple models. A system of n particles, given their initial speed and positions along with their masses, is such a simple model. Yet, solving for $n > 2$ is not simple.

This paper discusses, why that is a difficult problem and what could be done to get around that problem.

1. Problem Statement

Classical mechanics is essentially a linear, "first order" theory in which the dynamical quantities describe properties of the particles themselves, such as the law of inertia, $F = ma$, as well as energy and momentum conservation etc.

The gravitational force, $F = (const)\nabla\frac{m_1m_2}{|x_1-x_2|}$, is the exception to that theory: it is a product of quantities, namely the mutual interaction the masses, disguised as a linear first order quantity F . That makes it complicated to even deal with a gravitational interaction of two particles, necessitating elliptic integrals, Legendre polynoms, Bessel functions, and all that, in order to derive its solutions. But it can be done, and it involves some beautiful mathematics and calculations, which explains, why it's done in physics first hand up to this day. The result is that the particles move (with their reduced masses) around the center of mass in all curves given by the intersection of a plane with a cone.

That is mathematically interesting, as it allows to describe the set of solutions through a hyperbolic, quadratic equation, namely that of the cone itself. And it straight leads to the question, if not a quadratic approach to the dynamics might be simpler to describe gravitational interaction.

2. The Cone

The picture of that cone is always that of a two-dimensional surface in three dimensions, because it is easy to visualize, but, even given the fact that one angular, cyclic coordinate can be eliminated, this is still inconvenient:

it is mathematically the product of two non-parallel intersecting lines and a circle. And the circle is well-known to yield us the conservation of angular momentum, which the Hamiltonian does then not depend on. So, let's drop it. We are then left with the two non-parallel lines in a two dimensional (Euclidean) coordinate system, which by proper scaling, transform into the diagonals of \mathbb{R}^2 , that intersect in the origin. Let a, b denote horizontal and vertical axes. Then the original condition that the path of motion is to be the intersection of a plane with the cone reduces to the intersection of a line with the diagonals, i.e.: $a^2 - b^2 = 0$. That is an invariant, in fact *the* invariant of a mass point moving in a constant gravitational field. I am now free to scale a^2 , which I choose to be the square of total energy E^2 of the system, up to an additive constant of motion. Then $E^2 - b^2 = (Const)$ is a constant of motion. And, as E is a constant of motion, E^2 is conserved, so b^2 , and b must be conserved, too. Since a is now measured in units of energy, b will have to be of the same dimension. Now, in any closed system, there always exists at least one other energy quantity that must be conserved, namely the energy of the system, in which all particles are at rest with respect to each other. Let me call it a rest system. That system generally is not uniquely defined, though: At any instance of time t_0 I can freeze the system, be it stable or not, and calculate its energy $E_{rest}(t_0)$ at this frozen state, disregarding its internal kinetic motion. Then, up to an invariant, additive constant, I get for the two-particle system

$$E^2 - E_{rest}(t_0)^2 = \pm T(t_0)^2,$$

where $T(t_0) = \frac{1}{2}\mu v^2$ is the kinetic energy of any one of the particle moving around the center of mass and $\mu := \frac{m_1 m_2}{m_1 + m_2}$ is the reduced mass.

In the following I'll laxly drop the distinction between reduced mass and mass (which means that I'll tacitly assume the moving mass to be small compared with the total mass).

Next, to get rid of the additive constant, I define the energy E to converge to zero at large spatial distances. So, the Hamiltonian function H boils down to

$$H^2(\vec{x}, \vec{p}) = E_{rest}^2 + \text{sign}(m) \left(\frac{1}{2m} p^2 \right)^2,$$

where E_{rest} includes the rest energy including all of its potential energy (which is a function of \vec{x} and $\text{sign}(m)$ could be ± 1 , at least in principle. And it takes a sheer convention to fix the sign to be always positive: It is agreed that the energy it takes to speed up a mass, must be positive. So, we end up with

$$H^2(\vec{x}, \vec{p}) = E_{rest}^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2m} p^2 \right)^2. \quad (2.1)$$

Now, it is generally overlooked in classical mechanics, that time inversion $\mathcal{T} : t \mapsto -t$ is equivalent to energy inversion $E \mapsto -E$: this is, because energy, that is gained along a path $\gamma : t \mapsto \gamma(t) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ from start time t_0 to end time t_1 is equivalent to an energy loss from t_1 to t_0 in the opposite time direction, and, by having E be zero outside the system, we fixed the value of a possible constant to be zero. Likewise, parity $\mathcal{P} : \vec{x} \mapsto -\vec{x}$ inverts momentum. So, the fact that the above equation is in terms of squares, just states the conservation of energy and momentum.

Let's now see, how we get from 2.1 to the well-known 1st order Hamiltonian $H(\vec{x}, \vec{p}) = mV(x) + \frac{1}{2m}p^2$:

We know that by taking the root of E^2 , we can determine H or E only up to an additive constant, i.e. an invariant of the motion, and we know that the (square of the) kinetic energy is such an invariant. So, we can solve for $H^2 - E_{rest}^2 = 0$ and add the kinetic energy later. But $H^2 - E_{rest}^2 = (H - E_{rest})(H + E_{rest})$. To get rid of one of the factors of the r.h.s. it is (for simplicity) postulated that H and E are of the same sign for all mass locations \vec{x} . Then $H^2 - E_{rest}^2 = 0$ if and only if $H - E_{rest} = 0$. Defining $V(\vec{x}) := \frac{1}{m}E_{rest}(\vec{x})$, where $m > 0$ is the mass of the (moving) particle outside the center of mass, and adding its kinetic energy $\frac{1}{2}mv^2$ then gives the desired relation.

There is however at least one grain of salt into it: in order to deliver contraction, given the positivity of m , V must be negative, so $E(\vec{x})$ is negative, when the moving particle is sufficiently slow. And the reason for that is that by picking a special solution for the squared equation, the symmetry of energy/time inversion is broken: the intersection of the two diagonals with upper/lower right/left quadrants of the 2-dimensional coordinate system breaks the diagonals into 4 parts, which bijectively transform onto each other by one or two inversions of the coordinate axes. And these inversions happen to be symmetries. Then each of these four describe the same (equivalent) curves of motion. What is the deal with gravity? It is the sign of mass we deliberately assign: we assign it such that gravity attracts, and then we say, that mass is positive. Note, that the symmetric equation depends on the square of the mass, so its sign is irrelevant. That way, given a negative mU , we could make it positive by mass inversion and will get a positive energy.

3. Stability of the 2-particle system

In order that 2-particle system at rest is to be stable, at least all forces in the system must add to zero, so that the acceleration vanishes. And if other forces than gravity were missing, then the only stable solution at rest, is within the center of mass. So it appears to be natural, to define E_{rest} to be taken as the energy of all particles is at rest at their (mutual) center mass. However, the particle generally won't stably reside in there, because quantum physics forbids it: without these additional short ranged forces, the mass density of systems would be allowed to become unbounded, which is not

what we observe. The particles will therefore align next to each other. While the progress of this alignment itself implies an unelastic collision, which is outside the bounds of our model, it well describes small perturbations around that stable state.

4. Gravity in a closed n-particle system

So far, we have found another dynamic invariant of the two-body problem. Albeit not a cyclic coordinate for the Lagrangian or Hamiltonian mechanics, but in terms of squares of energy: it's $E^2 - V_1^2$. And because it is a cyclic coordinate for two particles, it is for any n-particle system with gravitational interaction, which is invariant over time, such as e.g. a rock or a bar of iron:

In the above two-particle problem, the center of mass at rest could be itself a system of $n - 1$ pointwise particles, of which the particles are allowed to be in motion, while the n-th particle, of which we extracted its kinetic energy, is at rest w.r.t. the center of mass. As long as the particles don't collide with this n-th particle, given that one of the moving particles, say the k-th particle does not collide with all the others, I can freeze that system at any time and extract the square of kinetic energy of the k-th particle as a constant of motion. So, if the system is such that all particles do not collide with each other, I end up with $E^2 - E_{rest}^2 = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} T_j^2$, where the T_j^2 is the square of the of the kinetical energy of the j-th particle (for the reduced mass).

I have some trouble, though to determine E^2 and E_{rest}^2 , but the r.h.s. is a conserved quantity, and it qualifies as square of heat or temperature, T^2 .

If only we could extend that relation to closed n-particle systems that allow for collisions, then we would have shown that the temperature of a closed gravitational system of particles was a dynamic invariant, which would prove that heat would be freely transferrable from one gravitational system to another!

So, let's do that:

Mathematically, a free 1-particle system is a particle of some mass $m > 0$, that moves in time along a straight line at constant speed, an as such has a constant momentum and energy. With this, a free n-particle system can mathematically easily defined as the n-fold product of 1-particle systems.

Physically, even a 1-particle system is constrained over time t to the inner of a 3-dimensional box with elastic walls, namely the walls of the laboratory, which shield to the outside, and the mathematical line becomes a segmented path of lines with edges at the boundary, where the collisions with the box happen. Because at the collision with the boundary the ingoing angle is equal to outgoing angle and the absolute value of speed of the particle before and after collision with the box are the same, the whole path still qualifies as a

line, if only taken modulo inversion \mathcal{P} of the location coordinates: the outgoing line is bent parallel to the ingoing line by a suitable reflection of location coordinates: the principle of momentum conservation is equivalent to the symmetry of space-inversion. So, physically, the reflected path is dynamically equivalent to the path, that just passes straight through the boundary without any impact.

Now let's overlay n such pathes within the container. Then the paths will probably intersect. Let k paths of masses intersect in a point \vec{x}_0 at a given time t_0 . Then, knowing the momenta of these particle paths, we know the momentum of the center of mass of the colliding particles and can transform to the system where the center of mass is at rest. In this frame all colliding particles bounce back at the collision point in opposite direction (given elasticity). That is: outgoing paths are the location inverted ingoing paths. So, again we get that momentum and energy conserving collisions are invariants, not affecting the dynamics.

In the presence of gravitational interaction, the only change to the above is the addition of a velocity-independent acceleration to the center of mass of the colliding particles, and we get the same result locally again.

What will happen, when collisions are allowed to be inelastic? Then the flux of energy within the system will not be constant in time, contradicting the assumption made that the system is to be invariant over time.

5. The mass problem

In all, we showed that for a closed gravitational system of N masses $(m_j)_{1 \leq j \leq N}$, which is invariant over time, the quantity

$$E^2 - E_{rest}^2 = T^2 := \sum_j \left(\frac{1}{2m_j} p_j^2 \right)^2, \quad (5.1)$$

is conserved, where E^2 is the square of its total energy, E_{rest}^2 the square of energy of the system, for which the particles' motion is frozen out at a given time t_0 , and T^2 , its square temperature, is sum of the squares of the kinetic energy of the particles. As above, we may deliberately restrict the system to be deviating slightly from a stable frozen system with all particles at rest.

So, given the masses and intial motions of these, we determine and extract the kinetical energy of the closed system, which leaves us a system with all particles at rest. And of this system we can then calculate its potential gravitational energy V , say. But neither do we know E^2 , nor E_{rest}^2 : Because with this, we could perhaps calculate, how much of the potential energy maximally may be transformed into motion and therefore into mechanical work! Because the gravitational potential is negative and proportional to $\frac{1}{r}$, where r is the distance of the mass to the center of mass, the potential can be minimized by rearranging the body to a densely and packed ball of radius r . But, because that potential energy is also proportional to the mass m of

the body itself, we can deliberately partition that mass into fractions that all add up to the same mass m again, and the field itself, representing the potential energies of these pieces must weigh 0.

Not astonishingly, General Relativity says the same: If we extract the energies $m_k c^2$ from E_{rest} and arrange these with their kinetic energy $|p_k|c$ then what remains of E_{rest} is a massless field, which is to be replaced with the corresponding space-time curvature, caused by the masses m_k .

And now test it against the inert energy: We have from 5.1 above: $E^2 = E_{rest}^2 + T^2$, and because the center of mass is at rest for the total system, T^2 being only its internal kinetic energy, E^2 and not E_{rest}^2 is the energy of its rest mass! And this makes $M = \sqrt{E_{rest}^2 + T^2}/c^2$ its rest mass. So, inert and gravitational mass should differ. And the straightforward, perhaps difficult way to test that (because of heat dissipation), will be to heat up the mass of a mathematical pendulum (preferably shielding it by a tube in vacuum): From $F = \sqrt{m_0^2 + T^2}/c^4 = -m_0 g \phi$, where g is the gravitational constant and ϕ a small angle with the vertical rest position, the period Π becomes $\Pi = \frac{\sqrt[4]{m_0^2 + T^2/c^4}}{\sqrt{m_0}} 2\pi \sqrt{\frac{l}{g}}$, (l being the rod's length), which raises the (the period for $T = 0$ by the factor $\frac{\sqrt[4]{m_0^2 + T^2/c^4}}{\sqrt{m_0}}$.

In order to get at the equivalence of inert and gravitational mass for $T > 0$, it would then be necessary to allow gravity to increase with temperature. But that will result into a temperature-dependent blue-shift of the atomic spectrum, which cannot be observed. So, the equivalence of the masses is lost.

Once we accept the inequality of inert and gravitational mass for $T > 0$, what can be done to align with General Relativity, is to express the inert mass in terms of curvature of space and time. That way, the masses m_k would again be extracted from the from the "frozen system", described by E_{rest}^2 , and assembled with the momenta p_k . And the rest of E_{rest} would then go into the space-time curvature.

So, again there is strong evidence, that only a fraction of the total energy of a rigid body can be transformed into kinetic energy, which might appear possible from the equation $E^2 = E_{rest}^2 + T^2$: If only E is to be constant, then we can lower E_{rest} , whilst increasing T^2 : However at a minimum, E_{rest} must still contain all the individual rest masses of the particles; so, not all of E_{rest} could be transformed into T .

6. Anti-Gravity

Take a step back and return to the 2-dimensional unit cone in three dimensions, the product of the diagonals with the unit circle, in which the vertical axis is taken to be the gravitational potential. Hyperplanes parallel to the horizontal plain then intersect the cone in a circle (where the potential is constant), at polar angles from $0 < \theta < \frac{\pi}{4}$ the interections are ellipses, at $\theta = \frac{\pi}{4}$ these are parabolae, and then up to $\theta \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ the intersections are hyperbolae.

Rotation around the vertical axis covers the possible intersections in the upper halfplane. The lower halfplane, which is symmetrical, is left out: why? - because, if the upper vertical axis is to be understood to be negative (in order to gain at the concept of attraction, then the lower, inverted axis will represent a positive potential, which would represent the opposite of attraction.

The answer given in the beginning was that the fear is unfounded: The gravitational potential $V(r)$ is not defined as the potential energy of a mass m at distance r , but per mass m . Hence, the energies $mV(r)$ and $(-m) \cdot (-V(r))$ are the same in both regions.

Though, since the masses in $E^2 = E_{rest}^2 + T^2$ come in squares, allowing masses of either sign, then also $(-m) \cdot V(r)$ should be physically realizable, which would mean anti-gravity.

To get around the anti-gravity, General Relativity considers the whole physically experiencible world to live inside a closed and convexly curved space-time. Hence, all observers will just see the inside, but not the maliciously concavely curved outside.

Perhaps surprisingly, that argument overlooks the immaterial heat $T := \sqrt{T^2}$: Add heat to a system of masses: if not already moving (w.r.t. the center of mass), the particles will start to move around the center of mass (if not transferring that heat in an inelastic collision to other particles), and the moving ones will increase their distance to that center otherwise, in other words, the negative potential energy will become less negative. So, that heat is transformed into potential energy. No matter is known that may sustain heat: it rips even atoms apart and lifts molecular fractions as gas up in the sky (against the gravitational force), and conversely the lifted gas particles will fall down again towards that center, if their temperature becomes lower than that of their neighborhood: even Helium atoms fall down as $T \rightarrow 0$.

In terms of General Relativity: The immaterial heat is flattening out the convexly curved space-time again: In a non-expansive and non-contracting conservative system gravitational pressure and thermal expansive pressure add to zero. And that would be anti-gravity. We can even go a step further: We can define the gravitational mass as the maximal amount of heat that the system may withstand the thermal expansion (and vice versa).

7. Electrical mass

All that is simply 19th century chemistry. Let's proceed with it: It is currently commonly said that the driving motor for the industrialization of mid 18th till end of the 19th century was the steam engine: I beg to differ: energy consumption would not be possible without energy delivery. And it was chemistry that showed how to get more out of matter than just gravitational energy, like throwing pebbles or pouring water downhill:

Take a chunk of coal, coke it for a day say, i.e.: add heat to it, until you get a porous solid piece of carbon (with other fluid and gaseous substances).

Then pour the same amount of liquid O_2 over the carbon and ignite that immersion. The result will be gaseous carbon dioxide and millions of times more heat than could be gained from its gravitational energy: any gas already steadily expands, if not constrained by an external force. According to chemistry, that enormous amount of energy came from the binding energy that was released by the reaction $C + O_2 \rightarrow CO_2$.

This opens the next layer of $E^2 = E_{rest}^2 + T^2$: Because the force between charges is proportional to the gravitational force, they still obey that equation. The only difference up to a constant, big factor is that charges are anti-symmetrical w.r.t. parity \mathcal{P} , whereas neutral masses are symmetrical w.r.t. parity. So, given the symmetry of time-inversion \mathcal{T} , the product $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{T}\mathcal{P}$ is to be an anti-symmetry for charges, which is the charge inversion (see e.g. [1]). (Again, it is nothing new: Maxwell formulated his equations in terms of Hamilton's quaternions, which are mathematically equivalent to spin matrices; and he did that in view of the fact that the magnetic field of a flux of charges inverts under parity.) Today we also know that all particles that come with an a non-zero gravitational mass, are composed of charged particles.

Two unanswered problems for experimental physics: Is the weight of the gas CO_2 equal to the weight of O_2 plus the weight of carbon before? And the second: we know that a single electron has an inert mass greater zero. Does it also have a gravitational mass?

For now, missing experimental verification, what remains is to deduce the answers theoretically: Because the total energy, the total energy of all particles at rest, and the heat of a closed system of masses is to be the same as that of its charged particle composites, the heat or thermal energy created by the chemical process $O_2 + C \rightarrow CO_2$ must come from E_{rest}^2 , which therefore decreases: a weight loss is to be expected on side of CO_2 . Since electrical charges are supposed to be elementary and conserved - note that only the squares of the charges enter E_{rest}^2 , so it's the square of charges that is conserved first hand, and from that the charge conservation is derived - charges cannot be converted into thermal energy, and one could expect the electron to weigh nothing. Gravitational energy would hence be conceivable as being caused by the chemical/electromagnetic binding of charged particles.

References

- [1] H. D. Hüttenbach, *From Bernoulli to Laplace and Beyond*, <http://vixra.org/abs/1801.0025>, 2018.